

**REMARKS**

Claims 7 through 27 are currently pending in the present application and are presented for consideration upon entry of the instant amendment, which is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In response, Applicant has amended claim 21 to correct the grammatical error. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 7 through 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,860,131 to Armstrong (hereinafter "Armstrong"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claims 7 and 22 now provide for a key-changeable lock containing, *inter alia*, a sliding block that slides linearly in a direction perpendicular to the rotational axis.

Armstrong provides for a method of rekeying a rekeyable lock cylinder. In Armstrong , the spring alignment tips 146 are part of retaining cap 82 (not 80 as misnumbered in Figs. 22A-D), which can rotate about an axis of rotation in response to rotation of the key. However, because retaining cap 82 is fixed with respect to the rotational axis, spring alignment tips 146 cannot slide linearly in a direction perpendicular to the rotational axis. Thus, Armstrong does not disclose or suggest a sliding block that slides linearly in a direction perpendicular to the rotational axis as recited in claims 7 and 22. Accordingly claims 7 and 22 are patentable over Armstrong.

Furthermore, the function of the sliding block of the present application is highly advantageous over the assembly of Armstrong. Because the sliding block is used in conjunction with toothed piece 3 and toothed slide 4, it eliminates the need for a

separate clip or pin to be inserted in a second hole in order for a user to switch to a second key.

In addition, when a lock needs to be changed to correspond with a second or different key, the first or original key is often lost or otherwise unavailable. The key-changeable lock of the present application does not require the first or original key. In contrast, the assembly of Armstrong requires the insertion of the first key in order to rekey the lock.

For at least the same reasons as provided for independent claims 7 and 22, dependent claims 8 through 21 and 23 through 27, respectively, by virtue of this dependence are patentable over Armstrong. Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 through 21 and 23 through 27.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims present in this application patentably distinguish over the cited prior art reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims. Also, Applicant respectfully requests that this application be passed to allowance.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with Applicant's attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq.  
Registration No. 28,468  
Attorney for Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: (203) 327-4500  
Fax: (203) 327-6401

March 27, 2009